UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

\*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

13-cr-142-01-PB

V.

\* March 27, 2014 \* 11:15 a.m.

JOHNATHON IRISH

\*

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED BAIL HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN J. MCAULIFFE

## Appearances:

For the Government: Nick Abramson, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

53 Pleasant Street Concord, NH 03301

For the Defendant: Jonathan Saxe, Esq.

Federal Defender Office

22 Bridge Street Concord, NH 03301

Probation Officer: Sean Buckley

## BEFORE THE COURT

THE CLERK: The Court has before it for

consideration a bail hearing in the matter of United

States of America versus Jonathon Irish, Criminal No.

5 | 13-cr-142-01-PB.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Saxe, I was a little confused. There was a stipulation to detention. Now you're moving for bail?

MR. SAXE: Yes, because at the time he stipulated to detention, your Honor, he was being held on state charges in Rockingham County. Those charges were dismissed. So now the only thing that's holding him up was the stipulation of detention in this case. So that's the deal.

THE COURT: All right. Whenever you're ready.

It's the government's burden. Go ahead, Mr. Abramson?

MR. ABRAMSON: Yes, your Honor, it is our

burden in this case. There is no presumption under

19 3142. So we carry the burden of showing by clear and 20 convincing evidence that he poses a danger to the

21 community and by preponderance that he's a risk of

22 flight.

While I think we meet the threshold in full here, I'm going to focus on the risk to the community because I think that is real and substantial in this

```
1
    case.
2
              I did file a lengthy memorandum in support of
    detention so I won't belabor the point here, but I will
3
4
    walk through some of the highlights for you.
                         I've read it.
 5
              THE COURT:
                             The first of which is that the
              MR. ABRAMSON:
 6
7
    nature of these crimes are quite serious. The defendant
    is charged primarily with engaging in the business of
8
9
    dealing in firearms without the requisite federal
10
    firearms license, but it wasn't just any firearms.
                                                         Ιt
11
    was assault rifles, which, as we all know, are
12
    notoriously dangerous weapons.
13
              THE COURT: Why are they so notoriously more
14
    dangerous than any other firearm? They look more
15
    dangerous, but it's just a firearm, isn't it?
16
              MR. ABRAMSON: Well, your Honor, I would
17
    submit that they are more dangerous.
18
              THE COURT: In what sense?
19
              MR. ABRAMSON: I think that they are typically
20
    considered by people in the field to be more of a
2.1
    military grade weapon that is inherently more dangerous.
22
              THE COURT: Kills you just as dead as another
23
    firearm; right?
24
              MR. ABRAMSON: That's true, and that's not
25
    something I'm going to focus on. But I do think they're
```

quite dangerous, and he was placing them in the stream of commerce with no paperwork, no way to track them, no records.

As part of that scheme, he was using his girlfriend to go into gun stores and purchase the assault rifle or receivers so that no background check was conducted on him. There would be no delay, and he could quickly obtain the firearms to build and sell.

And I would note that as you can see in Section 3142(g)(1), Congress has called particular attention in making this calculation to crimes involving firearms.

THE COURT: They were sort of talking about use.

MR. ABRAMSON: I think that certainly heightens it, but they do identify crimes involving firearms, explosives, or destructive devices as the type or kind that we should be paying particular attention to in these calculations.

As far as the detention determination as a whole, we obviously take a more holistic approach. So we then -- in the event that the Court looks at these types of crimes as, for example, not the typical armed bank robbery, hands-on child exploitation case, the type of case that might clearly warrant detention, we do look

at a number of other factors under 3142, and I think that each of those factors when you walk through them militates strongly in favor of detention in this case. First of all, with respect to the weight of the evidence, as I said, I've walked through that in the memorandum. I won't walk through that at length here. More concerning is the defendant's criminal history and the nature of the danger that he poses to the public. With regard to his criminal history he's I

With regard to his criminal history he's I believe 27 years of age. His criminal history is already two pages long. I understand that none of those are technically felony offenses, but it is a quite extensive criminal history, and I can tell you that there's a banker's box full of police reports from perhaps a dozen New Hampshire police departments sitting in my office that are not reflected in his criminal history. He does have extensive experience with law enforcement at a very young age.

He also, as we've seen in a lot of these police reports which is not reflected in this criminal history, does have a personal history of violent and aggressive behavior and of use of firearms in support of that violence and aggressive behavior, and I've listed a few of those in the government's memorandum.

For example, in August of 2012 a police report

from Brentwood, New Hampshire, details an incident in which Mr. Irish confronted two teenage girls in his neighborhood who were playing a prank on a friend and brandished a firearm during that confrontation.

On February 23rd, 2013, there's a recorded conversation in which the defendant mentions that he was glad he didn't bring his daughter to a firearms rally in front of the Concord State House because he was afraid there might be a fire fight with law enforcement.

In September of 2013, even more recently, he brandished a firearm yet again, according to a police report, when a neighbor was driving through his neighborhood and he confronted that neighbor claiming that he was driving too fast.

In late October of 2013, the defendant asked the local police for permission to fire blank rounds at children to scare them at Halloween.

These are just a few examples of his history of behavior where he uses firearms. He's essentially a bully with an affinity for firearms, and I think that poses a real and substantial threat to the community.

More specifically in this case, we have specific threats, recorded threats, that the defendant has made with regard to multiple potential witnesses in this case. We've obtained recordings of his jail calls.

In one of his jail calls he refers to his girlfriend, who I will refer to here as ST, and he states that if anything happens to his daughter, he will, quote, put her in a hole.

He refers to another friend in a separate call and states essentially that if that friend cooperates and testifies, he will, quote -- and I have to say the word is a little unclear. It's either slit or cut his throat. And later on in the call says that he will bury him.

And, finally, there is a third potential witness in this case, the lead case agent, Philip Christiana of the FBI, whom the defendant has given particular attention and blames for his current legal troubles, and in multiple calls he boasts about having Googled Agent Christiana's address and knowing where he lives, and he states that he knows where Agent Christiana's family goes to church.

So I would argue that even beyond the general threats and the specific threats, putting a finer point on that is the fact that we have received information that the defendant reached out to a former associate to find out about the possibility of obtaining a firearm if he was released pending trial.

So I think we need to take all of those into

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

account, his history of violent and aggressive behavior with firearms, his specific threats in this case, his criminal history, and his possible attempt to obtain a firearm if he's released make a very strong case for detention here.

The final point I will make, which I know we are looking at primarily the danger to the community and the risk of flight, but I think there is a very real risk of tampering in this case. We do have evidence that -- I should step back for a moment. As Attorney Saxe just explained to you, when he first -- when the defendant first stipulated to detention, there was an ongoing state case involving the defendant and his girlfriend. During that time period his girlfriend was cooperating with the government. She was providing information to the government about the defendant's criminal activities. In some of the defendant's recorded jail calls, he reaches out to a friend and asks that friend to pass a message on to the girlfriend stating essentially either we both go down for this or she's going down for this.

Very shortly thereafter, the girlfriend decides to stop cooperating with the government, reconciles with the defendant, and we've seen communications from the girlfriend to other potential

witnesses in this case stating that she's going to do everything she can to help him get off of his federal charges.

So I think given the threats he's made, the actions that he's taken with respect to his girlfriend, there is a very real risk of witness tampering in this case if he's released, and given that trial is only a month away, that is something that concerns me.

So that's the detention issue, and I don't think we should get to the second issue here because I think he should be detained. But the second issue is if you do release this defendant, who is the appropriate custodian? Who is the appropriate person to whom he should be released? And the defense has suggested that an individual named Tony Costello would be the person with whom the defendant would reside if he was released pending trial.

I have several concerns about that. The first which was -- which I was alerted to by Mr. Buckley just before this hearing is that in a conversation last night Mr. Costello represented that he does not have a criminal history, and we are still in the process of developing this, but it seems like there is some potential that he does in fact have a criminal history.

My second concern is that Mr. Costello was the

1 individual through whom the defendant reached out to his 2 girlfriend while he was in prison to essentially try to 3 get her to change her position. So we are talking about 4 taking this defendant with all his baggage and his 5 background and placing him with an individual who has previously -- and he's admitted this to an FBI agent --6 7 passed along messages from the defendant to witnesses. So for all of those reasons I would strongly 8 9 recommend that we detain this defendant pending trial. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Abramson. 11 Saxe? 12 MR. SAXE: Thank you, your Honor. 13 respect to Mr. Costello, the reason why he needs 14 someplace to stay is that he survives on SSI, 15 disabilities that he has, physical and mental 16 disability, and that's cut off while he's in jail. 17 he needs to stay at a place for a period of time until 18 his payments get back on and then he can get his own 19 place. 20 So I contacted Mr. Costello. Mr. Costello's 21 name was given to me and I contacted him and I was under 22 the impression that he had no criminal record. 23 does have one, I would agree that's not an appropriate 24 place. We could find another place. So I think that 25 issue can be addressed separately from the issue of

whether my client's a flight risk or a danger to the community. So if you make a finding that he's not a flight risk or a danger to the community, we could find another place. So I don't think that that's an issue.

As far as his -- he has no ties anywhere else as I put in my motion. I contacted his mother, who couldn't be here today because she's watching the couple's child. The child's mother, Stephanie Taylor, is here today, and she was referenced in part of the government's argument. And so his whole family lives here, his grandmother, his grandfather, his mother, his sisters, everything is here, his child is here. And he has Social Security Disability. He can't run. He doesn't have any money to run, and he doesn't have anywhere to run to. So I don't think that's the issue. I think -- I don't accept this argument, but obviously the better argument from the government's perspective is whether he's a danger to the community because the case involved guns. That's potentially an issue.

so I would call the Court's attention to page eight of the government's objection to my motion and it was referred to by the government in their presentation. It says: Jonathon has made -- this is an email -- or it's not an email. It's a chat from Stephanie Taylor, who's in the courtroom right now, using a different

email address, and she says: And we agree that this is what she said. Jonathon has me using his Facebook to get in touch with people as I had to delete my account for many reasons. His message to you is do not trust his sister Leslie and he -- it's probably mistyped -- and be nice cause more than likely everything that she may have to say to your or anybody is not true. I'm working with those that I can get him off of his state charges and his federal charges.

Now, first of all, I don't think that that's really evidence of anybody obstructing justice in any way.

More importantly, I would call your attention to Exhibit B because that implies that he's going to use this conversation -- that this conversation is evidence of him trying to use Stephanie Taylor to get him off his federal charges; right? But if you read the rest of that email -- or the chat, it says -- and I will read the whole thing. I'm working with those that I can to get him off of the state charge, and his federal charges, well, he says he's just going to take a plea hoping that he can get out in six or eighteen months.

That doesn't sound like that's evidence that he's trying to use her to tamper with witnesses in this case. He's telling her I'm going to plead guilty. So I

```
1
    suggest that that's not evidence of witness tampering at
2
    all, and it is a little bit misleading.
3
              THE COURT: It's probably hearsay, but is it
4
    evidence of knowledge of quilt?
5
              MR. SAXE: He's saying -- my point is this.
    My understanding of the reason why that was offered by
6
7
    the government is to show --
              THE COURT: Whatever it was offered by the
8
9
    government for, what's its character and nature? You're
10
    citing language that one person attributes to your
11
    client that suggests knowledge of guilt or acceptance of
12
    quilt.
13
              MR. SAXE: Well, they are offering that to
14
    show that he's trying to tamper with a witness in this
15
    case, and my position is --
16
              THE COURT: He wasn't trying to tamper with a
17
    witness. He's going to try to plead guilty.
              MR. SAXE: Right. So that's not evidence he's
18
19
    tampering with a witness. That was one of the main
20
    arguments.
21
              THE COURT: Let's accept that. Is it evidence
22
    of knowledge of guilt?
23
              MR. SAXE: You could argue that. But it's
24
    definitely not evidence of witness tampering. I mean he
25
    could have confessed to the police, and that's not a
```

1 reason why he shouldn't be out on bail I would suggest. 2 THE COURT: Well, it might be because it could 3 show the evidence is overwhelming -- of his quilt is 4 overwhelming. MR. SAXE: It could go into the reasoning. Μy point is I think the government is concerned about 6 7 witness tampering here, and I don't really think that that's an issue and I think that that was not evidence 8 9 of witness tampering at all. 10 I would also suggest that my client has made 11 numerous completely wildly inaccurate claims about a lot 12 of things, okay, and if you look through the reports by 13 the FBI agents that investigated this case, their 14 reports are replete with examples of that, and I would 15 take -- call the Court's attention to Exhibit C, 16 Defendant's Exhibit C. In the second paragraph, 17 WatchDogIrishIII -- that's my client's moniker. At the 18 end of the second paragraph he says: Then I went to the 19 sandbox. These kids don't get it. 20 That means he went to Iraq. 21 If you look at the fourth paragraph down, 22 it's, again, another statement by WatchDogIrishIII, 23 which is my client. He's telling this person on the 24 line: When I worked with the contractors and got home, 25 it wasn't much for me. Combat experience, shooting

people and blowing shit up, not much of a call for that here back home. So I build AR-15s. It pays the bills usually.

Okay. So that is an utterly fanciful statement. He never went to Iraq. He was never in the military. He never built AR-15s for people in Iraq. And this discovery contains tons of statements like that.

Also on the issue of guilt, your Honor, I would call the Court's attention to Exhibit D, which is again received in discovery. The undercover in this case is an individual who runs this place called Charlie Company. He is a key player in this case. There's probably 50 CDs worth of recordings. Many of them are in his store recording not just my client, but they have recordings of militia meetings and meetings of people that are in groups that don't appreciate, most specifically, the Obama administration or the federal government.

So if you look at Exhibit D, what this is, your Honor, is my client is in a phone conversation with this guy Milton who's -- he's not undercover. He's the CI and he's the guy that runs -- the federally-licensed firearms dealer. He has a license. And the history there is that my client worked for Milton at his

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Army/Navy store. He was there when Milton got his
license as a firearms dealer. They're very close, and
he's kind of a like a father figure to my client. At
least he was before this case happened.
          So this is the conversation. They're charging
my client with running a firearm business without a
license. And what this conversation is -- and I will
bring you through it afterward, but essentially this is
a situation where my client is contacting Milton because
he wants to sell -- Milton wanted his guns. And Milton
is a licensed firearms dealer.
          So he brings the gun and he says I want to
sell this to you for $900. And at this point in time
Milton is working for the FBI, and Milton says, oh, no,
I don't have any money. I can't buy the firearm.
need to sell it to Mike.
          Well, Mike is the FBI. So my client says,
well, I want $900 for it. It cost him $976 to build.
And he's going to sell to Milton for $900. Milton says,
no, you need to sell it to Mike. And then my client
says, I will sell it to you for $700. And then Milton
says, I don't have $700. You need to sell it to Mike.
And then Milton calls Mike.
          So that sounds somewhat like entrapment to me.
I mean, that's like the federally-licensed dealer -- my
```

```
1
    client trying to sell a firearm in a legal way to a
    licensed dealer and the licensed dealer pushing him off
2
    to sell it illegally to the federal agent who's acting
3
4
    undercover.
              Now, I will just walk you through this.
    you look at page three, CHS, that's the informant. JI,
6
7
    that's my client. And in the middle of the page my
    client says: You can sell -- you can register this as a
8
9
    sure valid weapon and sell it for three grand, but I'm
    not doing that. And then my client says: Because I
10
    don't have my Class 3. In other words, because it would
11
12
    be illegal.
13
              Then if you skip forward to page five, CHS
    four lines down, says: Boy, you really put some coinage
14
15
    in this. Meaning, this must have cost you some money.
16
    My client says: Actually not much, more than what I'm
17
    selling it to you for. Like I said, I have a total of
18
    967 into it. And then Milton says: And you want to
19
    sell it to me for how much? And my client says: Nine.
20
    It's losing money.
21
              That's not really in the business of selling
22
    firearms.
23
              And then the undercover -- Milton says
    essentially: I don't have the money right now. There's
24
25
    the little sentence there where he says I need to put my
```

two grand into an escrow account.

Then if you skip down four, five paragraphs up from the bottom of the page: I'm going to be tied up with money for at least a couple weeks, but if you want I can reach out to Mike. It's up to you. And so my client says, yeah. And then Milton says, okay, I will give him a call. He will give Mike a call. And my client says: Okay, a sale is a sale. And then Milton says: It's up to you, brother. And then Milton says: I will reach out to him, meaning Mike.

So then he calls Mike. But before that my client says: I figured out where it's going to go anyway, or from you I will take seven.

So he's going to lose \$200. He's offering to sell it to the licensed dealer for 200 bucks less than he made it for, 260 bucks less than he made it for. And Milton says, no, I'm not going to take it. You've got to sell it to Mike.

Then he makes a phone call, at the bottom of the page, to Mike, and he says, hey, Mike, -- Mike, the undercover agent -- it's Milt over at Charlie Company. Want to do me a favor and call me as soon as you get this, okay? I want to talk business. I want to talk business.

So as far as running an unlicensed firearm

4

24

25

1 business, that's not what this sounds like. And there's more of this. I don't have it all, but there's more of 3 this, okay? So as far as the charge of running an unlicensed firearm business, there's a problem with their case there. There's a big problem with their case 6 on that. And everything goes through Milton. Every 7 transaction occurred in Milton's store, and I'm 99 percent sure while Milton was in the store every time 8 9 and I think in most, if not every one, Milton's in the room while the transaction is going on. So I would 10 11 suggest to you that there's a very strong entrapment 12 defense in this case which goes to the strength of the 13 government's case. 14 And then there's a lot of recordings where my 15 client says things, like I'm doing this for -- look 16 here, he says that. He says yeah. At one point in one 17 of the recordings he says I made 30 of these, 40 of these. Ridiculous. He never made 30 or 40 of these. 18 19 He's a disabled person because he has one eye and mental 20 disabilities, living this close to the poverty level, 21 and he's willing to sell a gun for less than he made it 22 for to his father figure Milton, the guy that runs the 23 store.

Just some other things that he said, and these come from Agent Christiana's reports. Agent Christiana

1 interviewed a lot of people. He interviews someone named Crystal Marie Rogers. Irish did tell Rogers on 2 Facebook he was building guns and that was how he, 3 4 Irish, made his living. Irish told Rogers he's spent 5 time in Iraq during the Iraq War and he was building guns while in Iraq. 6 7 Total fabrication. They then -- Mr. Christiana interviewed James 8 9 Brown. In part of his report he says: Irish told Brown 10 he worked for Blackwater overseas and suffers from PTSD. 11 Brown does not believe Irish. A ridiculous story, it's 12 just not true. 13 He is is a gun nut. He wants people to think 14 he's a military guy. He's got mental illness. He wants 15 people to think he's this huge figure in the American 16 militia movement, which is nonsense. 17 And then Mr. Christiana interviewed a Paige 18 Watterson. Irish told Waterson he was honorably 19 discharged from the military. He had many guns because 20 of his CIA job. Irish told Waterson he has guns to 21 protect Cheyenne from being taken by the state. 22 That's -- Cheyenne, that's his daughter. 23 Mr. Christiana interviewed a Joseph Sutkas 24 (ph). Irish told Sutkas he and his friends have a line 25 on an H1 Hummer that's fully armored. On his Social

Security Disability I guess. Irish said to Sutkas he was -- on numerous occasions he worked for Uncle Sam and he served overseas in the sandbox. He has told people that I'm an armorer for the police. And on and on and on, these crazy, crazy statements that you can't take out of context. They want you to believe the part where he says I'm making my living selling AK-47s, but they want you to take out the part where he says I did it in Iraq, I learned how to do this in Iraq.

So I think if a jury hears all the evidence and is aware of what he's like and the things that he says, that their case is not necessarily as strong as the government says it is. And also I think that goes to whether or not he's a risk.

Now, the government has in their pleading talked about a number of events that occurred which sound disturbing. It's on page six, okay? He made a YouTube video in which he stated that any perceived threats to his family will be met with deadly force.

Well, I mean, given the nature of all the things that he says and the fact that he doesn't have any record for ever using force or deadly force, I don't think he has any assault convictions on his record.

And, by the way, his record may be several pages long, but a lot of those things didn't even result in

convictions. The ones that did were either violations or misdemeanors and he never went to jail.

Regarding the Brentwood Police Department, on August 12th reports filed by the Brentwood, New Hampshire, Police Department detailed an incident in which the defendant confronted with firearms two teenage girls who parked in the neighborhood.

What happened is he sees a car -- there had been a lot of break-ins with burglaries. He sees a car parked out in the middle of the road with no lights on and nobody in it. So because he's a gun nut, he goes out there with a gun. And there's no one in the car. And so he calls the police. He calls the police, not the girls, and says there's something going on here. The girls come. He has a gun. I'm sure they were scared to death because there was a guy there with a gun.

He was never charged with anything on that.

There was no charges at all. He was never charged or convicted of anything regarding that incident.

Then the firearms rally, I don't know if you remember that, your Honor, but I'm a liberal, you know, so I consider people like my client to be gun nuts. And at that rally there was a ton of them and there was a lot of them that were armed. If you look at the

2.1

pictures, my guy's -- my client's standing there with a rifle, a gun, and there's a guy next to him with a gun, and there was a whole bunch of those people there. But that's not illegal. You can have a gun inside the legislature. So that's not illegal for him to do.

Again, there's another incident where someone was driving -- this is on page seven of their report.

An individual was driving through and there was a confrontation with my client. My client called the police. There were no charges. He wasn't charged with anything.

And as far as my client asking the police for permission to fire blank rounds at children, there was a discussion about him requesting permission to fire blanks as part of a scary thing, but I don't think he ever requested that he fire blanks at children. Plus he called the police.

All right. So I would suggest, your Honor, that my client's dangerousness is being somewhat overblown by the government here. I understand that there's a concern because it's a firearm charge, okay, but there's also a concern because he is a Second Amendment, right-wing libertarian guy who stands up for his rights, all right? He doesn't have much of a criminal record, never -- I think he might have been in

2.1

jail for a very short period of time for something, but I'm not even sure about that. These are all minor violations, either misdemeanors or just violations or they were dismissed. He's definitely not a flight risk because there's nowhere he could go.

There would be a requirement that he not have a firearm. I realize today we don't have a residence for him, but I think if you make a finding that he should be released, I could find a place. I thought this one was okay, but I had some other places where they want him to stay. A lot of his friends have a ton of firearms. So I had found a good place for him to stay, but the guy had 125 firearms and he said I'm not going to get rid of. So I would assume he had no record.

THE COURT: What about these implicit threats to the FBI agent and his family?

MR. SAXE: Oh, thank you very much. It just so happened when my client -- at least this was my information. That the agent lived about a mile from his house and went to church at the end of my client's street. So that's how my client knew where he lived. He lives right next to him. So it's not I don't think an issue of him finding out that my client lived somewhere and casing him out and claiming to do

```
something. I don't think that's the case. If I'm wrong
1
2
    I'm sure I will be corrected, but my client lived very
    close to him. He knew where he lived and knew where he
3
4
    went to church because the church is right there.
5
              THE COURT: Yes. Source of knowledge isn't
    the issue. It's the intent or the comment is the issue.
6
7
              MR. SAXE: I'm sorry, your Honor?
              THE COURT: It's not the source of the
8
9
    knowledge that's at issue. It's the intent of the
10
    comment. Why does one say I know where his children go
11
    to church? Why would you say that if you're not
12
    threatening?
13
              MR. SAXE: I think, your Honor, that -- well,
14
    I know that my client was in regular contact with Mr.
15
    Christiana all the time, not thinking there was going to
16
    be --
17
              THE COURT: I'm sure they talked every day,
18
    but still the question remains.
19
              MR. SAXE: I don't think he's a threat to Mr.
20
    Christiana.
21
              THE COURT: I'm sure you don't, but the
22
    question remains, what's the intent of the comment?
23
              MR. SAXE: Which comment was that?
24
              THE COURT: The effect of I know where your
25
    family and children go to church. I may not understand.
```

MR. SAXE: He's making comments about everything all over the place. I think that you need -- you can't really evaluate whether he should be released without evaluating the fact that he just makes all kind of wild claims about guns and military and Blackwater ops. Oh, one of the other claims was I was in the border patrol down in Texas. Just nonsense, not true, and I think they know that.

So I will just ask that you consider that, and I don't think that given all these facts that they meet their burden.

THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Saxe. Mr. Abramson?

MR. ABRAMSON: Your Honor, I just have two

quick points. The first is -- I'm not going to get into

the weight of the evidence. I understand the entrapment

argument. I think that's an argument that's better

suited for trial. There's multiple other charges here

where the evidence is overwhelming involving guns.

With respect to these fanciful stories, one of the charges here is that the defendant lied to a federal agent about the whereabouts of his firearms during the course of this investigation. We are talking about releasing a defendant who would presumably be reporting to probation and giving accurate information about his whereabouts about whether he had firearms. I think his

nature of lying, if we accept that as true, is problematic in that sense.

And finally a point that I meant to make in the beginning, which is also very concerning, is the defendant's ability to build firearms. I won't call him an expert, but he knows how to build firearms. He knows how to build assault rifles from component parts. So even in the event that we are able to prevent him from purchasing a firearm or acquiring a firearm from a friend, if he's able to find the basic parts, he could easily build a firearm wherever he's residing.

So I will rest on those points.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. SAXE: Briefly, your Honor. The only place he can buy the parts to build a firearm is from a firearms dealer. So it's not like he has parts lying around at home. It's just like buying a gun when he buys the parts to build a gun. It's just like buying a gun. As a matter of fact, that's one of the charges, that he bought the parts.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Saxe, I appreciate it. I've considered the nature of the evidence, the weight of the evidence, the defendant's criminal history, likelihood of recidivism as indicated by that criminal history, the fact that the defendant definitely

```
poses in my judgment a danger to the community and
1
2
    persons within the community, and given those findings I
3
    find that there's no condition or combination of
4
    conditions that will reasonably assure the safety of the
5
    community and persons within the community, and
6
    therefore the defendant shall be detained pending trial.
7
              And I will issue a detention order shortly.
8
    Court's adjourned.
9
               (Adjourned at 11:50 a.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Diane M. Churas, do hereby certify that the
4	foregoing transcript is a true and accurate
5	transcription of the recorded proceedings, to the best
6	ability and belief.
7	Diane M. Churas
9	Submitted: 11/21/14  DIANE M. CHURAS, LCR, RPR, CRR LICENSED COURT REPORTER, NO. 16 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
23	
23	
25	
ر ک	